

Unless better care be taken, the future antiquary will consider them "London's lasting shame" for another and more recent reason.

The statue of the Duke of Wellington put up in the open area next the keep is anything but satisfactory: it is at the same time poor and pompous.

When strangers are in the City they should not fail to visit the Guildhall, too, which was begun in 1411, and preserves much of its ancient character. It was the scene of a brilliant gathering on the evening of the 9th, when the corporation entertained her Majesty, Prince Albert, and the leading persons connected with the Great Exhibition. With much to applaud, especially the introduction of many beautiful specimens of sculpture, the decorations were a little too theatrical, to our mind. The panels of the ceiling were coloured a deep blue, and a thousand garlands of artificial roses hung from the ceiling to the walls, and assisted to disguise the incongruity which is strikingly observable between these two portions of the building. The ancient crypt was very effectively fitted-up, we are told, for the Queen's supper-room; but we did not succeed in penetrating its recesses. Not the least striking parts of the spectacle were the thousands upon thousands of persons of all grades who filled the windows and lined the streets leading to the Hall,—quiet, orderly, and pleased. A careful examination of the social and political position of the individuals composing this crowd to welcome Queen Victoria, with that of those who filled the streets when Queen Mary or Queen Elizabeth left the Tower,—when opinions, drawn out by the "cravat" or "thumbcrew," were punished by the scaffold,—would show how greatly ameliorated is the condition of the people, and justify sanguine anticipations of future progress.

EXPRESSION IN ARCHITECTURE.*

Fictions may be necessary in law or elsewhere, but we need them not in architecture. In manners, affectation and pretence are a sign of low breeding; whatever is borrowed is vulgar; and it is so in art. As well hoist fictitious sails to a steam packet, or harness wooden horses to a railway carriage! Beauty lies buried in the remains of ancient nations, and we have to revive this beauty, not the plans in which it is found. This seems to be but imperfectly recognised. We are doubtless reforming, but the spirit of copyism is by no means quite cast out. Many churches of late and present erection for the reformed worship in different parts of the kingdom, are not Protestant churches, which need neither aisles nor transepts. Our new buildings are, too many of them, but reproductions of the old. I have been in modern Gothic churches in which the slightest trace of mental independence, or the least struggle for freedom, is looked for in vain—where all is borrowed thought, even to the hinges and scutcheon, and door-handle. An absolute stranger to our practices going into one of these churches could never guess for what kind of ritual it was intended:—processions and other ceremonies of the Roman church would be suggested by many arrangements in places of worship where the congregation held such practices in abhorrence. Such buildings fail to indicate their purpose, because they are not adapted to their purpose. They are intended for Protestant places of worship, but are not what a Protestant place of worship should be, viz., a simple auditorium, as Professor Cockrell, following the dictates of common sense, once remarked in his lectures.

* See p. 431, ante.

Now, arched buildings divided into nave and aisles can no more express the simple ideas of the Protestant ritual and worship than a Windsor chair can the purposes of a dining-table, and it would be quite as easy to make the former article pass for the latter. Why should the simple and beautiful forms of square and circle be rejected, and the complex and less pleasing cross be used? We can accommodate the greatest number within a given distance from the speaker in a circle, which, together with the octagon, or semi-octagon, or semi-circle joined to a short parallelogram, or the horse-shoe or semi-ellipse, are, for the double purpose of hearing and seeing, unquestionably the best, while nothing can possibly be more unfit for these purposes than either the Greek or Latin cross, particularly when again divided by piers and arcades. Surely we may use that symbol of redemption without marring our plans with it. Sometimes, for economical reasons, galleries are required in these churches, but no general form could be more unfit for their reception. The introduction of galleries makes the matter worse: they have to be placed just where they should not,—where there is no height for them; and the occupants, while space is wasted in the height of the clerestory, are thrust so near the ceiling that they have scarce room to breathe. Further, there is no division in the arrangement of the congregation answering to this marked division into lofty nave and lowly aisles: the only distinction that could be made analogous to it would be of the rich and poor, fashionable and rustic, which would of course be an odious one.

To such as these many of the old dissenters' chapels, in no style at all, are consistency itself. The wide projecting galleries that generally characterise these erections, have been found fault with; and indeed many of them transgress, in point of proportion; but the worst of them are at least commodious and rational. The most common-sense plan of a Protestant place of worship, in my opinion, and beyond all comparison superior for that purpose to the church interiors of the day, is that adopted at the principal Wesleyan chapel, Liverpool, imitated, I doubt not, elsewhere,—in London most likely anticipated. This chapel is, so far as its general section goes, both horizontal and vertical, the perfection of an auditorium. It partakes of the general character of the theatre, being built in the form of the letter D, i. e. a semicircle joined to a short parallelogram: there is no gallery, but in lieu of one, the seats rise in gradation from the ground or arena (which is a similar figure to that of the main outline) in concentric semicircles, and the inclination is greater than in theatres generally. How far, in its minutiae of form, or other respects, acoustic qualities are provided for, I pretend not to say; but the general arrangement of fittings, which, by the way, is as applicable to the entire circle, the square, or octagon, is admirably adapted to the leading features of Protestant worship, and is capable of receiving every modification which minor considerations might dictate. Moreover, this plan of interior possesses to a greater extent the grand quality of unity: you see the whole at once, and the effect, particularly when animated by a full assembly, is striking; for however imposing the result of particular parts in the Gothic church, there is certainly some advantage in an arrangement that lays bare the whole place, and gives the entire at a glance.

It cannot be maintained that the nave and aisle division and section are inseparable from the Gothic ecclesiastical style. I know that buttresses arose in reference to a vaulted stone ceiling, and were designed to resist its thrust. But windows, doors, porches, western towers, lanterns, spires, pierced parapets, tracery, and other beautiful features and elements, had no such reference, and are independent of the theory. Multiplicity is a principle non-essential in Gothic architecture, which is not governed by one material form, or mode of roofing, or partitioned into one fixed general arrangement, but may be used with any plan and section, and is as applicable to the simple square, octagon, or oblong department of equal

height, as to the cruciform and arch-divided interior.

I have spoken approvingly of our dissenters' chapels generally as regards fitness; and indeed the palm of fitness may be awarded to them with justice; but in artistic qualities they are most of them greatly deficient, as in their style and embellishment they give no intimation of a religious use, nor express anything that we naturally associate with theology.

The Methodist, Independent, and other chapels in our large towns, as to their size, quality of construction, and material, a credit to their founders; but they might be taken for exhibition or concert-rooms—for anything but religious houses. There are other buildings similarly erroneous,—that do not fulfil the conditions laid down as essential to a true work of art. Some have chosen the wrong order, and express the very opposite qualities. We have grave and solemn for gay and elegant, and vice versa; ornaments mischosen and misplaced—wreaths, garlands, festoons, where ideas of meekness and humility should have reigned; small, whimsical ornaments, exhibiting the wantonness of fancy have been employed in the interior of apartments on which a solemn character should have been inscribed, and where ideas of reverence should be inspired. Minuteness of detail and elaboration of ornament are opposed to all sublimity and grandeur in architecture; as they are in poetry and the other arts. As silence is sometimes more eloquent than words, so there are circumstances under which the absence of ornament, using the word in its restricted sense, is more expressive than the best selected decoration could be.

In giving expression to a building the architect must not only consider what are the uses to which it is to be applied, but he must consult the spirit of the age in reference to these uses, and inscribe upon it a character in harmony with the present or improved nature of the institution. The same institution may and often does assume a different aspect or character with the march of intellect and progress of society, and will require a different plan and a different character of expression in consequence,—an additional reason why the architect should free himself from association, and why he must not be guided by the character of an ancient building for a similar institution. A college, for example, built in the 19th century should have a different expression to one of the 13th, the nature and purpose of education, the very idea suggested by literature and learning being no longer the same. Learning and wisdom are not now shut up in cells, confined to the libraries and brains of monks, nor made to consist of unintelligible definitions and verbal subtleties; and science and literature no longer the associates of seclusion and gloom will in future beautify the spirit of active life, and become means of practical usefulness. Further, prior to the revival of classic literature, the Gothic architecture was a most appropriate style for libraries and seats of learning; but it may be questioned if at the present day the case is not somewhat different. The Antique style of architecture has now, I suspect, an equal or superior claim to the distinction, a principle asserted in the Radcliffe Library, at Oxford, the British Museum, the London University, and other buildings.

What I have remarked of the college applies in some measure to the palace, the church, the theatre, the music-hall, the mansion, and other buildings; royalty, religion, domestic habit, &c., being changed. A palace for Queen Victoria should be different to one of Henry the Eighth; and music is differently appreciated to what it was in the days of Handel, when the audience ascended to the assembly-room by a step-ladder. A further consideration should be the position of the building: not only the general composition, but the entire character should be influenced by respect to situation, i. e. whether it be on a plain, in a valley, on the side of a hill, or on its summit, or as it is seen from many or few points of view. The same building would become more important, and call for higher decoration, or greater dignity if removed to a more public place. Different situations call